APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,957	09/27/2000	Inching Chen	42390.P9234	8316

8791	7590	09/06/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER
CZEKAJ, DAVID J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2613	

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 June 2005*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *4-9, 13 and 33-38* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *4-9, 13 and 33-38* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

On pages 6-7, applicant argues that Wee fails to disclose decoding at least the

set of macroblocks but not the plurality of macroblocks into pixels. While the applicant's

points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. See for example Wee

column 26, lines 25-34. There Wee discloses decoding only the bottom rightmost

macroblocks indicating that the set but not the plurality of macroblocks have been

decoded into pixels. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

On pages 8-9, applicant has challenged the examiners official notice. A

corresponding reference has been supplied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 4-6 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Koyanagi et al. (5557332), (hereinafter referred to as "Koyanagi") in view of Wee et

al. (6553150), (hereinafter referred to as "Wee").

Regarding claims 4 and 33, Koyanagi discloses an apparatus for parallel

decoding prediction-coded video signals (Koyanagi: column 1, lines 10-12). This

apparatus comprises "decoding a picture into a plurality of slices having a set of

slices at least partially within an area of the picture" (Koyanagi: column 6, lines 34-45, wherein the set of slices are the set of three slices which are decoded (the second, sixth, and tenth slice)), "decoding the set of slices into a plurality of macroblocks" (Koyanagi: figure 2), and "decoding the macroblocks into pixels" (Koyanagi: column 10, lines 50-55). However, this apparatus lacks not decoding the plurality of slices as claimed. Wee teaches that prior art computing systems must entirely decompressed/decoded a video signal even if only a small part of the signal is being edited (Wee: column 2, lines 4-10). To help alleviate this problem, Wee discloses only decoding a set of slices (Wee: column 24, lines 39-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Koyanagi and add the decoding taught by Wee in order to obtain an apparatus that operates more efficiently by only decoding the necessary slices of the image thus reducing the computation time on the processor.

Regarding claims 5 and 34, Wee discloses "the area is a region of interest" (Wee: column 10, lines 45-59, wherein the region of interest is the object).

Regarding claims 6 and 35, Koyanagi discloses "displaying the decoded set of macroblocks" (Koyanagi: figure 15, item 124).

3.   Claims 7-9 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnamurthy et al. (6496607), (hereinafter referred to as "Krishnamurthy") in view of (Dekel et al. (6314452), (hereinafter referred to as "Dekel").

Regarding claims 7 and 36, Krishnamurthy discloses an apparatus that identifies and uses regions of interest to provide functionalities (Krishnamurthy: column 1, lines 8-12). This apparatus comprises "creating and transmitting a substream from a stream, the substream corresponding to a region of interest" (Krishnamurthy: figure 1, column 4, lines 32-67 – column 5, lines 1-17, wherein the stream is the input sequence). However, this apparatus lacks creating and sending the second substream to a second recipient. Dekel teaches that prior art computing systems do not support efficient transmission of data (Dekel: column 1, lines 40-44). To help alleviate this problem, Dekel discloses creating a second MPEG substream that is different than the first ROI" (Dekel: figure 7, wherein the stream is created for a new ROI) and "transmitting the substream to a second recipient" (Dekel: figure 1, wherein multiple clients are shown receiving the substreams). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Krishnamurthy and add the transmission system taught by Dekel in order to obtain an apparatus that becomes more versatile by being able to transmit data to a plurality of different users.

Regarding claims 8 and 37, Krishnamurthy discloses "synchronizing display of the substream with a second substream" (Krishnamurthy: figures 1 and 4, column 6, lines 39-44, wherein the buffers synchronize many streams).

Regarding claims 9 and 38, Krishnamurthy discloses "the creation and transmission of the substreams are performed in a lock step manner"

(Krishnamurthy: figures 1-3, column 4, lines 32-67 – column 5, lines 1-17,

wherein the lock-step manner is the creation and synchronization).

4.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wee et

al. (6553150), (hereinafter referred to as "Wee") in view of (Dekel et al. (6314452),

(hereinafter referred to as "Dekel").

Regarding claim 13, Wee discloses "decoding a picture from a stream"

(Wee: column 21, lines 45-48), "selecting a plurality of different regions of

interest in the picture" (Wee: figure 10, column 10, lines 45-65, wherein the

region of interest is the object/ICR, wherein the plurality of different regions is the

multiple regions and ICR's), and "constructing a plurality of different new pictures

corresponding to the plurality of different regions of interest" (Wee: column 21,

lines 30-50, wherein the new picture is the picture contained the updated color

information of the ball, the plurality of different groups is the multiple region

groups). However, Wee fails to disclose transmitting and displaying the pictures

to multiple nodes. Dekel teaches that prior art computing systems do not support

efficient transmission of data (Dekel: column 1, lines 40-44). To help alleviate

this problem, Dekel discloses "transmitting the plurality of new pictures to a

plurality of nodes" (Dekel: figure 1, wherein the plurality of nodes are the plurality

of clients) and "commanding the nodes to display the picture" (Dekel: figure 2,

wherein the clients receive the data for subsequent display). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Wee and add the transmission

system taught by Dekel in order to obtain an apparatus that becomes more versatile by being able to transmit data to a plurality of different users.

Conclusion

5.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (571) 272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DJC

VU LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER